Pages 1 - 13

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY, MAGISTRATE

IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC. CONSUMER) NO. 18-MD-02843 VC (JSC) PRIVACY USER PROFILE LITIGATION,)

San Francisco, California Wednesday, June 23, 2021

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS VIA ZOOM WEBINAR

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs:

KELLER ROHRBACK LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200 Seattle, Washington 98101

BY: DEREK W. LOESER, ESQ.
CARI C. LAUFENBERG, ESQ.
DAVID J. KO, ESQ.

BLEICHMAR, FONTI & AULD LLP 555 12th Street, Suite 1600 Oakland, California 94607

BY: LESLEY E. WEAVER, ESQ.
ANNE K. DAVIS, ESQ.

MATTHEW P. MELAMED, ESQ.

For Defendant:

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP 200 Park Avenue New York, New York 10166-0193

BY: ORIN SNYDER, ESQ.

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

Reported by: Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR #5812, CRR, RMR Official Reporter - U.S. District Court

1	APPEARANCES: (via Zoon	m Webinar; continued)
2	For Defendant:	
3		GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP 1881 Page Mill Road Pala Alta Galifornia 04204
4	BY:	Palo Alto, California 94304 MARTIE KUTSCHER CLARK, ESQ.
5		GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP 333 South Grand Avenue
6	BY:	Los Angeles, California 90071
7		GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
8 9	BY:	2100 McKinney Avenue, Suite 1100 Dallas, Texas 75201
		· -
10	Also Present:	HONORABLE GAIL A. ANDLER DANIEL B. GARRIE, ESQ.
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Wednesday - June 23, 2021

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8:31 p.m.

2 PROCEEDINGS

3 ---000---

THE CLERK: Court is now in session. Calling Civil action 18-md-2843, In re Facebook, Inc.

You don't have to state your name, but just state your name before you speak.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everyone.

And good morning, Judge Andler and Mr. Garrie. Thanks for being here this morning.

So I didn't receive a joint status update, so I'm going to set my own agenda based on the last update that I got, because I need a joint one. If I don't have a joint one, then I'm not going to do it.

So what I think I need to do is set -- the last update, on May 17th, the parties said they would be submitting a case schedule in short order. I don't believe I've received that, so I want to give you a deadline to give that to me. And the deadline I'm thinking about is July 2nd.

MR. SNYDER: That's fine for Facebook, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Loeser?

MR. LOESER: Yes, that's great, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So July 2nd. Hopefully you can work with Mr. Garrie and Judge Andler to get that in.

If you don't have an agreement or what you don't have agreement on then just submit competing proposals.

So the next issue that was raised in that update was the app developer materials, which, of course, I had given my guidance on that. There was definitely stuff that wasn't privileged that could be produced.

We had our discussion, and it turned out what the plaintiffs needed might be in there. So has that been resolved or not?

MR. LOESER: That has not been resolved, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. July 2nd, then, I want either it's resolved or give me -- you know, what I need to know, because I believe we came away from that hearing with Facebook saying there was stuff that they could produce, so I need to know what it is you're producing, what are you not producing, and the plaintiffs saying why they need what they're not producing. Because I've already looked at this stuff.

The next issue was TAR. Have the parties reached any agreement as to that?

MR. LOESER: Your Honor, the parties have not reached agreement as to TAR.

MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, may I be heard? Because I appreciate the agenda and we agree with it.

Just very briefly, we were doing great in mediation on all these issues. Beautifully. And it was a nice traveling rodeo

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
of mediation and parties because Mr. Garrie was in Greece,
another one was here, and we all were getting along great.
were following each other in ours travels, working diligently
multi times a week. And then about a month ago or so it became
less so.
     And, from our perspective, just very briefly, and I don't
want --
         THE COURT: No, Mr. Snyder. I do not want to get into
     I'm setting deadlines. The parties can work with Judge
Andler. And you're seeing Judge Chhabria tomorrow. Raise it
with Judge Chhabria.
         MR. SNYDER:
                      I wanted to ask --
         THE COURT:
                    No, no. My question was about TAR.
         MR. SNYDER:
                      Yes.
                     I assume you were saying something about
         THE COURT:
TAR.
         MR. SNYDER: Yes, I'll cabin it to TAR.
         THE COURT:
                     Okay.
         MR. SNYDER: What we think would be helpful, Your
Honor, because I share your frustration, is that all these
issues be required to be the subject of mediation; that if we
reach an impasse on any issue, because Judge Andler and
Mr. Garrie have been really neck deep in all these issues that
they send Your Honor a report and recommendation.
                     No.
                          I already rejected that. I already
         THE COURT:
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
     rejected that, Mr. Snyder.
 1
          And this was the whole thing. The whole thing about the
 2
     mediator was a suggestion to the parties. And it wasn't an
 3
 4
     order. It was a suggestion to the parties.
 5
          I do not have the power in this MDL to order you guys to
     select a mediator. And the parties selected and agreed to
 6
     Judge Andler with Mr. Garrie, and had been making great
 7
    progress, and I assume will continue to make great progress.
 8
          I think that what will be helpful is if I give a deadline
 9
     that will compress and help with making that progress.
10
11
              MR. SNYDER: I'm not --
              THE COURT: But I'm not going to order --
12
              MR. SNYDER: That's fine.
13
              THE COURT: -- anything. You can take it up with
14
15
     Judge Chhabria.
16
              MR. SNYDER: We will.
17
              THE COURT:
                          And I think you should.
18
              MR. SNYDER: We will.
              THE COURT:
                         He needs to get involved with this, which
19
20
     I will tell him.
21
              MR. SNYDER: Thank you.
22
              THE COURT:
                          I do not have that power. I do not have
```

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Judge.

Okay. All right. So I already addressed

23

24

25

that power.

THE COURT:

that.

The TAR, to the extent there's a dispute, July 2nd. And then the search strings on groups 5 through 8. Has that been resolved?

MS. KUTSCHER CLARK: That has been resolved, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Excellent. All right. So there's enough to do.

So now I think you have a good agenda. And whatever else -- but I don't want to hear about anything else because I don't have a joint statement on that -- you take up with Mr. Garrie and Judge Andler.

One more thing is the motion with respect to the confidentiality designations. I will issue an order, but let me tell you, I've read through that, and this is my view, which is, the conduct that occurred in that state case is the most egregious conduct I have ever seen. I'm just floored by it.

And to say, in my view -- and none of the cases really address this type of situation. In my view, to say that because of that clearly contemptuous conduct that now that they're out in the public that that means that for this litigation they cannot designate it as confidential -- and we'll address that -- would simply encourage and compound -- what the state court judge found was he found the crime-fraud exception with respect to this.

Not going to do that. And I don't think the plaintiffs actually want that because you know what's going to happen in every case going forward? The companies are going to fight tooth and nail, harder than they already do, about producing documents. You know, I don't think you want that at all.

So I'm inclined to amend the protective order to say that public disclosure for violation of the protective order in this case or another protective order doesn't mean they're publicly available.

That doesn't mean that they're all confidential or should stay confidential, as plaintiffs point out. But I don't have this in front of me and you haven't met and conferred on that. Some of them may be old, no longer of any competitive risk if they're produced.

But then we'll just address that as we address in every other case that I do every day, which is, if you want to raise it prefiling, you can do that. Or you can file it under seal, and it is Facebook's burden to show that it is confidential.

And, as you guys know from practicing in this district, we do not just accept that at all. Nearly every motion to seal we reject some of the things. We look at that very carefully. We don't just do it.

So that's my view, but I don't -- I frankly don't think any of my colleagues would ever say, oh, because in this other case they essentially stole these documents and got them out

there in the public that in this litigation we're going to say they can't address whether they're confidential or not.

Now, the plaintiffs, of course, have access to those.

Well, they had access to them anyway. It's not a matter of access. It's not like they're privileged; right? It's just a matter of how they're to be used in this litigation.

Anyway, that's my view. I don't know if the plaintiffs want to be heard.

MR. LOESER: Your Honor, I just have a question, which is, I think what makes this a difficult issue is that the document that we obtained from the NBC website, that's not something that was produced -- you know, Facebook didn't produce that to us and we turned around and took some stamp off. It was a public document that we obtained from a website, which is available, you know, on 20 different websites.

THE COURT: Yes. No, no, no, I understand that. And I'm not saying you did anything wrong.

MR. LOESER: Right.

THE COURT: I'm just clarifying it going forward, which is this: I can't control that. All I can control is what happens in this litigation. And what I'm saying, in this litigation plaintiffs should not use any documents that were stolen in that other litigation. That's what I'm saying.

You can use documents produced in this litigation, but no filing, no use in this litigation of what you get that was

stolen from the other litigation.

I'll give you an example. I have another case that I'm managing in which I denied discovery of certain documents, and the defendants cleverly, I must say, then did a FOIA request to those third parties to get the same documents.

And the plaintiffs then moved me to like, you know, stop the FOIA request. I said I don't have any power to do that. It was state law FOIA. State law says what it says. If they have the FOIA, they can respond.

What I can say is you cannot use those documents in this case. And so that's what we did.

So that's essentially what I'm saying. You can go to that website and download and get what you want. Obviously, they're publicly available. You can't use them in this case.

MR. LOESER: We can't use them, or they have to be filed under seal if we use them, which is what Facebook was seeking?

THE COURT: If you're filing it under seal, you're filing what Facebook has produced.

MR. LOESER: Well, there are some documents that are widely available public documents that Facebook has not produced.

THE COURT: Well, and were they stolen -- well, that's an issue then. If they're responsive, then if you're going to be using them then I would think they have been produced;

right?

MR. LOESER: Well, if only.

THE COURT: So, look, you know the state court judge issued its very long finding that those documents were made public in violation of that protective order.

You should not use them in this case unless they are filed under seal with that confidential designation. And then the burden will be on Facebook that they are unconfidential like it always is.

MR. LOESER: Yeah, that's a very helpful bit of additional information. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. That's the case. There's just no way -- there's no way I'm going to condone that conduct, which is really detrimental to just conducting litigation in -- you know, in general, when parties do that. It's really detrimental, I think, going forward. And so we have to be careful about what we do about that even in other cases.

I'll write something, eventually, because there weren't any other cases out there. And I think it would be helpful for lawyers to know what to do with those documents that are out there. You can see them. They're there. It's not right, of course.

Okay. So I think then we need another date. And I was going to propose July 28th, at 8:30. And if you want me to discuss anything other than my own agenda I suggest you submit

a joint status update.

MR. SNYDER: We hear you loud and clear, Judge.

MR. LOESER: That's always the goal, Your Honor.

You know, just very briefly on this issue of the confidence with Judge Chhabria, we did want you to know that we thought it would be useful to have Mr. Garrie authorized to call some balls and strikes as sort of the technical special master.

That's why we really wanted to have a statement go to you in which you saw that so that you didn't simply read in the transcript with our conversation with Judge Chhabria that was something we were interested in. We very much wanted you to know that, as well, because I think it would be very helpful in this case.

THE COURT: If the parties agree -- however you want to use Judge Andler and Mr. Garrie, if you agree I'm on board. I will not disagree with that at all. At all.

MR. LOESER: And I think the challenge is the "if the parties agree" part. And that's why we really wanted to raise it with Judge Chhabria, because it sounds like Facebook might not agree, in which case we just want to file a motion with the Court to have that authority provided to Mr. Garrie.

And, again, we just wanted you to know what we were thinking.

THE COURT: All right. Well, that's going to be up to

1	Judge Chhabria. Okay.
2	MR. LOESER: Thank you.
3	THE COURT: Thanks, everyone.
4	MR. LOESER: Bye-bye.
5	MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Judge.
6	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Garrie. Go back to your
7	vacation.
8	MR. GARRIE: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	(Counsel thank the Court.)
10	(At 8:43 a.m. the proceedings were adjourned.)
11	
12	
13	
13	
14	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
	<u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
14	
14 15	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
14 15 16	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
14 15 16 17	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
14 15 16 17	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: Wednesday, June 23, 2021
14 15 16 17 18	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
14 15 16 17 18 19	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR #5812, RMR, CRR
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 Kathania Sullivan
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR #5812, RMR, CRR